

1 BRIAN M. BOYNTON
2 Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General
3 Civil Division
4 JAMES G. TOUHEY, JR.
5 Director, Torts Branch
6 PHILIP D. MACWILLIAMS
7 Trial Attorney
8 D.C. Bar No. 482883
9 E-mail: phil.macwilliams@usdoj.gov
U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Division, Torts Branch
Benjamin Franklin Station, P.O. Box 888
Washington, DC 20044
Telephone: (202) 616-4285
Attorneys for the United States of America

10 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

12
13 C.M., on her own behalf and on behalf of
14 her minor child, B.M.; L.G., on her own
15 behalf and on behalf of her minor child,
16 B.G.; M.R., on her own behalf and on
behalf of her minor child, J.R.; O.A., on her
own behalf and on behalf of her minor
child, L.A.; and V.C., on her own behalf
and on behalf of her minor child, G.A.,

Case No. 2:19-cv-05217-SRB

17
18
19 **DEFENDANT UNITED STATES'**
20 **CONTROVERTING AND**
21 **SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF**
22 **FACTS AND OBJECTIONS**

23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25 United States of America,

26 Defendant.

27

28

1 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a) and LRCiv 56.1, Defendant United States
 2 submits the following Controverting and Supplemental Statement of Facts in response to
 3 Plaintiffs' Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for
 4 Partial Summary Judgment (ECF 379). The United States' Statement of Undisputed
 5 Material Facts in support of its Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF 372) also is
 6 incorporated herein. To the extent a statement of fact is responded to as undisputed in
 7 whole or in part, that is solely for purposes of summary judgment. Pursuant to LRCiv
 8 7.2(m)(2), Defendant United States lodges the following objections to the admissibility of
 9 evidence offered in support of Plaintiffs' Statement of Undisputed Material Facts In
 10 Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Plaintiffs' Motion for
 11 Partial Summary Judgment.

12 **CONTROVERTING STATEMENT OF FACTS**
 13

14 1. Undisputed that discussions regarding various immigration enforcement policy
 15 options, including options that would apply to family units, occurred. Disputed insofar as
 16 this statement of fact is intended to assert that the DHS Referral Policy that was
 17 ultimately adopted was intended by the decisionmaker, Secretary Nielsen, to use the
 18 separation of parents and children as a deterrent to migration. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 11-14,
 19 18-19 (and exhibits thereto), U.S. MSJ Ex. B Att. 1 at 46-47, U.S. Ex. B. Att. 2 at 18-19;
 20 *see also* U.S. Opp. Ex. D (McAleenan 331-344).

21 2. Undisputed that the quoted language appears in the media article used as
 22 Plaintiffs' exhibit. Disputed insofar as this statement of fact is intended to assert that the
 23 DHS Referral Policy that was ultimately adopted was intended by the decisionmaker,
 24 Secretary Nielsen, to use the separation of parents and children as a deterrent to
 25 migration. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 11-14, 18-19 (and exhibits thereto), U.S. MSJ Ex. B Att. 1
 26 at 46-47, U.S. Ex. B. Att. 2 at 18-19. Objection to cited media article for failure to
 27 authenticate the article and the quoted statements therein. Objection to quoted statements
 28 in cited media article as hearsay.

1 3. Undisputed that the quoted language appears in the referenced letter. Disputed in
2 that Plaintiffs submit no evidence that the referenced letter was presented to former
3 Secretary Kelly. Objection to quoted statements in letter for lack of foundation of
4 personal knowledge of matters stated therein. Objection to quoted statements from letter
5 as hearsay, and on ground that the declarants were not disclosed as an expert on the
6 subject matter of the statements therein or established as qualified to testify to the subject
7 matter of the statements therein.

8 4. Undisputed that the quoted language appears in the referenced letter. Disputed in
9 that Plaintiffs submit no evidence that the referenced letter was presented to former
10 Secretary Kelly. Disputed insofar as this statement of fact is intended to assert that
11 processes and mechanisms did not exist to coordinate communications between separated
12 family members. *See* U.S. SOF MSJ 31, 32, 33 (and exhibits thereto); U.S. MSJ Ex. F
13 (DeLaCruz Decl. ¶ 32); U.S. MSJ Ex. E (Helland Decl. ¶¶ 2-8). Objection to quoted
14 statements in letter for lack of foundation of personal knowledge of matters stated
15 therein. Objection to quoted statements from letter as hearsay, and on ground that the
16 declarant was not disclosed as an expert on the subject matter of the statements therein or
17 established as qualified to testify to the subject matter of the statements therein.

18 5. Undisputed that the quoted language appears in the referenced letter. Disputed in
19 that Plaintiffs submit no evidence that the referenced letter was presented to former
20 Secretary Kelly. Objection to quoted statements in letter for lack of foundation of
21 personal knowledge of matters stated therein. Objection to quoted statements from letter
22 as hearsay.

23 6. Undisputed that in July 2017 the U.S. Border Patrol’s (“USBP”) El Paso Sector
24 and the United States Attorney’s Offices for the Western District of Texas and the
25 District of New Mexico developed and implemented a prosecution initiative that did not
26 exclude from prosecution adults illegally entering the United States in family units for
27 violations of 8 U.S.C. § 1325(a). Disputed insofar as this statement of fact is intended to
28 assert that this prosecution initiative was a “pilot program” developed or directed at the
headquarters level of the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”), Customs and

1 Border Protection (“CBP”), or U.S. Border Patrol. *See* Pls. Ex. 9, 12; *see also* U.S. Supp.
2 SOF 1 and 2 (and exhibits thereto), *supra*.

3 7. Undisputed that under the El Paso Prosecution Initiative the minor children of
4 adults who were referred to the U.S. Attorney’s Office for prosecution were designated as
5 unaccompanied alien children (“UACs”) and transferred to the custody of the Office of
6 Refugee Resettlement (“ORR”). Disputed insofar as the statement of fact is intended to
7 set forth the precise sequence of events in all instances. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 26-28 (and
8 exhibits thereto).

9 8. Undisputed that the quoted language appears in the cited report. Objection to
10 quoted language from the cited report as hearsay and hearsay within hearsay.

11 9. Undisputed.

12 10. Undisputed that the quoted language appears in the cited report. Disputed insofar
13 as this statement of fact is intended to assert that enhancements to U.S. Border Patrol’s e3
14 system to document separations of family units were not made prior to the DHS Referral
15 Policy. *See* Pls. Ex 15 (describing enhancements to U.S. Border Patrol’s e3 system in
16 April 2018); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 1 (McAleenan 210-213, 374-378). Objection to
17 quoted language from the cited report as hearsay and hearsay within hearsay.

18 11. Undisputed that the quoted language appears in the cited report. Disputed insofar
19 as this statement of fact is intended to assert that enhancements to U.S. Border Patrol’s e3
20 system to document separations of family units were not made prior to the DHS Referral
21 Policy. *See* Pls. Ex 15 (describing enhancements to U.S. Border Patrol’s e3 system in
22 April 2018); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 1 (McAleenan 210-213, 374-378). Objection to
23 quoted language from the cited report as hearsay and hearsay within hearsay.

24 12. Disputed that the cited memorandum was from the U.S. Border Patrol El Paso
25 Sector and that the putative “recommendation” is an accurate quote from the document,
which states: [REDACTED]

26 [REDACTED]
27 [REDACTED]

1 13. Undisputed that the cited document was addressed to the DHS Office of Civil
2 Rights and Civil Liberties (“CRCL”) and the DHS Acting Inspector General and that the
3 quoted language appears in the cited document. Objection to quoted statements in the
4 cited document for lack of foundation of personal knowledge of matters stated therein.
5 Objection to the quoted statements from the cited document as hearsay.

6 14. Undisputed that the quoted language appears in the cited letter. Disputed insofar
7 as this statement of fact is intended to assert that the cited letter was received by
8 Secretary Nielsen. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 3 (DHS 30(b)(6) 275-277). Objection to
9 quoted language from letter as hearsay, and on ground that the declarant was not
10 disclosed as an expert on the subject matter of the statements therein or established as
11 qualified to testify to the subject matter of the statements therein.

12 15. Disputed in that Plaintiffs submit no evidence as to whether the letter was actually
13 received by Secretary Nielsen or anyone at CBP and ICE. Objection to quoted
14 statements from the cited letter as hearsay, and on ground that the declarants were not
15 disclosed as an expert on the subject matter of the statements therein or established as
16 qualified to testify to the subject matter of the statements therein.

17 16. Undisputed that the quoted language is from the deposition of this individual.
18 Disputed insofar as this statement of fact is intended to assert that the “concerns” raised
19 by organizations also were held by those at the meeting. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 4
(Wolf 323-324); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 2 (Homan 91-95); U.S. Opp. Ex. B.

20 17. Undisputed.

21 18. Undisputed, with the exception that the DHS Referral Memorandum was
22 transmitted to Secretary Nielsen through the Office of the Executive Secretary, not sent
23 directly to Secretary Nielsen from Commissioner McAleenan, Director Homan, and
24 USCIS Director Cissna. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 7 (and exhibits thereto).

25 19. Disputed that this is an accurate and complete quotation of Options 1 and 2 as set
26 forth in the DHS Referral Memorandum. *See* U.S. MSJ Ex. C Att. 3.

27 20. Disputed that this is an accurate and complete quotation of Option 3 as set forth in
28 the DHS Referral Memorandum. *See* U.S. MSJ Ex. C Att. 3.

1 21. Undisputed.

2 22. Disputed. The cited testimony refers to the U.S. Attorney Offices' resources as of
3 the date of the Zero Tolerance Memorandum (rather than the date of implementation of
4 the DHS Referral Policy), relates to the prosecution of all unlawful entrants (rather than
5 cases of unlawfully entry referred for prosecution), and does not state that the U.S.
6 Attorney's Office failed to devote sufficient resources. *See* Pls. Ex. 1.

7 23. Undisputed insofar as the statement of fact is intended to assert that the effects of
8 criminal prosecution, with the El Paso Prosecution Initiative being an example, was a
9 factor in recommending Option 3 in the DHS Referral Memorandum. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF
10 11 (and exhibits thereto).

11 24. Undisputed. Objection to quoted language from report as hearsay.

12 25. Undisputed that the quoted language appears in the cited email. Disputed insofar
13 as this statement of fact is intended to assert that the DHS Referral Policy would or did
14 result in separations of all family units apprehended for unlawful entry while the policy
15 was in effect. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 41 (and exhibits thereto); *see also* U.S. Supp. SOF 11,
16 *supra*; U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 5 (Jordan 93-95, 103-104).

17 26. Undisputed that the DHS Referral Memorandum itself did not set forth a plan
18 relating to communications and reunification of separated families. Disputed insofar as
19 this statement of fact is intended to assert that there were no existing processes relating to
20 communications and reunification of separated families to be utilized during
21 implementation of the DHS Referral Policy. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 30-31 (and exhibits
thereto).

22 27. Undisputed that the quoted language from Pls. Ex. 21 does not appear in the DHS
23 Referral Memorandum. Disputed insofar as the statement of fact is intended to assert that
24 planning and coordination with HHS relating to the DHS Referral Policy did not occur.
25 *See* U.S. MSF SOF 22 (and exhibits thereto).

26 28. Undisputed that Option 3 in the DHS Referral Memorandum was approved by
27 Secretary Nielsen on May 4, 2018. Undisputed that following the approval of Option 3,
28 and in implementation of the DHS Referral Policy, in the Yuma Sector when an adult

1 was identified as amenable to prosecution and to be processed for a referral for
2 prosecution a placement request with ORR was made for the child as soon as practicable.
3 See U.S. MSJ SOF 32, 35 (and exhibits thereto); U.S. MSJ Ex. D (Jordan Decl. ¶ 11);
4 Pls. Ex. 22, 23.

5 29. Undisputed insofar as the DHS Referral Policy resulted in a change in the
6 enforcement of immigration laws. Disputed that the DHS Referral Policy represented
7 significant change in all respects. See U.S. MSJ SOF 27, 30, 31, 42 (and exhibits thereto).

8 30. Undisputed.

9 31. Disputed insofar as this statement of fact is intended to assert that Border Patrol
10 agents received no training relating to the handling of situations where family units
11 would be separated. See U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 1 (McAleenan 308-310, 321-322).

12 32. Disputed. See U.S. MSJ SOF 22 (and exhibits thereto).

13 33. Undisputed that this particular individual did not recall any such planning
14 discussions. Disputed insofar as this statement of fact is intended to assert that there was
15 no notice to HHS personnel of the DHS Referral Policy or planning that involved HHS
16 relating to the DHS Referral Policy. See U.S. MSF SOF 22 (and exhibits thereto).

17 34. Undisputed that this particular individual did not recall notice of the DHS Referral
18 Policy until it was implemented. Disputed insofar as this statement of fact is intended to
19 assert that there was no notice to ICE personnel of the DHS Referral Policy or planning
20 that involved ICE relating to the DHS Referral Policy. See U.S. MSF SOF 22 (and
21 exhibits thereto); *see also* U.S. MSJ Ex. C. Att. 7 (email discussing coordination between
22 U.S. Border Patrol Yuma Sector and ICE Phoenix Field Office).

23 35. Undisputed that this particular individual learned of the DHS Referral Policy
24 through a DOJ press release or slightly before the Policy was announced. Disputed
25 insofar as this statement of fact is intended to assert that there was no notice to ICE
26 personnel of the DHS Referral Policy or planning that involved ICE relating to the DHS
27 Referral Policy. See U.S. MSF SOF 22 (and exhibits thereto); *see also* U.S. MSJ Ex. C.
28 Att. 7 (email discussing coordination between U.S. Border Patrol Yuma Sector and ICE
Phoenix Field Office).

1 36. Undisputed that the quoted language appears in the cited report. Objection to
2 quoted language from report as hearsay and hearsay within hearsay.

3 37. Undisputed that the quoted language is from the cited email. Disputed insofar as
4 the involvement of CRCL in DHS's policy-making and planning is at the discretion of
5 the Secretary of Homeland Security. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 3 (DHS 30(b)(6) 60-61,
6 182-183). Objection to the quoted language from the cited email as hearsay.

7 38. Undisputed that the quoted language is from the cited report. Objection to the
8 quoted language from report as hearsay and hearsay within hearsay.

9 39. Undisputed that the quoted language is from the cited documents.

10 40. Undisputed that a separation of a parent and child could occur even though the
11 prosecution referral of the parent was not accepted by the U.S. Attorney's Office.
12 Objection to cited portions of report at Pls. Ex. 13 as hearsay and hearsay within hearsay.

13 41. Undisputed as to Yuma Sector.

14 42. Undisputed insofar as this statement of fact is intended to assert that in May 2018
15 the Yuma Sector Prosecutions Unit would note issues with a case referred to the U.S.
16 Attorney's Office for prosecution. Disputed insofar as this statement of fact is intended
17 to assert that Border Patrol agents in the Yuma Sector Prosecutions Unit who prepared
18 the referrals knew the referral would be declined by the U.S. Attorney's Office. *See* Pls.
19 Ex. 24 (testimony of Agent R. that it was expected that the U.S. Attorney's Office would
20 perform their review); *see also* U.S. Supp. SOF 9, 10, *supra*. Objection to quoted statement
from report (Pls. Ex. 13) as hearsay.

21 43. Undisputed that the quoted language is from the cited document.

22 44. Undisputed that the quoted language is from the cited document.

23 45. Undisputed that the quoted language appears in the deposition testimony of the
24 referenced individual. Disputed insofar as the statement of fact is intended to assert that,
25 during the time period the DHS Referral Policy was in effect, there were no processes in
26 place relating to communications or reunifications of separated family members. *See* US
27 MSJ SOF 31 (and exhibits thereto); *see also* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 8 (Harper 44-45, 79,
28 122, 125-127, 141-142). Disputed insofar as the statement of fact is intended to assert

1 that a parent and child could not be associated without their respective alien numbers.
2 See U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 7 (Zanello 196) (testifying to other information and identifiers
3 used to track family members). Objection to quoted statements from report (Pls. Ex. 13)
4 as hearsay.

5 46. Undisputed that a separation of a parent and child could occur even though the
6 prosecution referral of the parent was not accepted by the U.S. Attorney's Office.

7 47. Undisputed that the quoted language is from the cited email. Objection to citations
8 to report (Pls. Ex. 13) as hearsay.

9 48. Undisputed that the quoted language is from the cited email. Disputed insofar as
10 the statement of fact is intended to assert that the views expressed therein by the ICE
11 official were adopted as policy by U.S. Border Patrol—a different agency from ICE—
12 when such situations occurred. See Pls. Ex. 41. See also U.S. MSJ SOF 26 (and exhibits
13 thereto); U.S. MSJ 16 n.13 (citing Ex. A Att. 1 (McAleenan 94-95, 222, 223, 293)
14 (testifying that decisions relating to revisiting UAC designations and potential
15 reunifications following prosecution were left to the discretion of Border Patrol); U.S.
16 Opp. Ex. A Att. 6 (Comella 200-201); Pls. Ex. 45.

17 49. Undisputed that the quoted language is from the cited email.

18 50. Undisputed that the quoted language is from the cited email.

19 51. Undisputed that the quoted language is from the cited draft document. Objection
20 to quoted statements for lack of foundation of personal knowledge of matters stated
21 therein. Objection to quoted statements from draft document as hearsay.

22 52. Undisputed that the quoted language is from the cited draft document. Objection
23 to quoted language as hearsay and hearsay within hearsay.

24 53. Undisputed that the quoted language is from the cited email. Disputed insofar as
25 the statement of fact is intended to assert that there was no mechanism or processes in
26 place for children in ORR shelters to communicate with parents in ICE detention. See
27 SOF 31 (and exhibits thereto); see also U.S. MSJ Ex. F (DeLaCruz Decl. ¶ 32); U.S. MSJ
28 Ex. E (Helland Decl. ¶¶ 2-8). Objection to the quoted statement for lack of foundation of

1 personal knowledge of matters stated therein. Objection to the quoted statement as
2 hearsay.

3 54. Undisputed that quoted language appears in the cited email. Objection to quoted
4 statements for lack of foundation of personal knowledge of matters stated therein.
5 Objection to quoted statements as hearsay and hearsay within hearsay.

6 55. Disputed that V.C. and G.A. sought asylum at the time of apprehension by U.S.
7 Border Patrol. *See* U.S. MSJ Ex. D Att. 5 (0150, 0155-157). The remaining is
8 undisputed.

9 56. Undisputed that V.C. and G.A. were transported to the Yuma Station. Disputed
10 that explanation of separation was provided in this manner. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 6
11 (Comella 29-30, 43, 203-208, 213-214, 220-221, 229-233, 401-402). Objection to use of
12 declaration as improper supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

13 57. Undisputed that V.C. and G.A. were temporarily separated while in Border Patrol
14 custody. Objection to use of declaration as improper supplementation and amendment to
15 deposition testimony.

16 58. Undisputed that children were provided opportunity to bathe while in Border
17 Patrol custody and that detainee movements within a Border Patrol Station involve
18 forming lines. Disputed that explanation of separation was provided in this manner. *See*
19 U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 6 (Comella 203-208, 213-214, 220-221). Objection to use of
20 declaration as improper supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony

21 59. Disputed. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 6 (Comella 29-30, 43, 203-208, 229-233, 401-
22 402). Objection to use of declaration as improper supplementation and amendment to
23 deposition testimony.

24 60. Undisputed that detainee movements within a Border Patrol station involve
25 forming lines.

26 61. Undisputed that V.C. avers as much. Objection to use of declaration as improper
27 supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

28 62. Undisputed that V.C. was informed of the destination of G.A. Disputed that
explanation of separation was provided in this manner. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 6

1 (Comella 203-208, 213-214, 220-221). Objection to use of declaration as improper
2 supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

3 63. Undisputed.

4 64. Undisputed that V.C. avers as much. Objection to use of declaration as improper
5 supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

6 65. Undisputed insofar as the first documented phone call between V.C. and G.A. was
7 on July 26, 2018. Disputed insofar as this statement of fact is intended to assert that
8 detainees were not provided with ways to communicate with family members. *See* Pls.
9 Ex. 84 (stating policy of access to phones in detention facilities); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 8
10 (Harper 79, 125-127) (testifying to detainee access to phones); U.S. MSJ Ex. F
11 (DeLaCruz Decl. ¶ 32); U.S. MSJ SOF 131 (and exhibits thereto). Objection to use of
12 declaration as improper supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

13 66. Undisputed that V.C. avers as much. Objection to use of declaration as improper
14 supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

15 67. Undisputed.

16 68. Undisputed that the Yuma Sector Prosecutions Unit did not refer V.C. to the U.S.
17 Attorney's Office for prosecution, but V.C. was processed for a criminal referral. *See*
18 U.S. MSJ SOF 116, 122 (and exhibits thereto).

19 69. Disputed insofar as V.C. was apprehended for violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1325 and
20 detained during the pendency of the criminal referral process. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 80, 86
(and exhibits thereto).

21 70. Disputed that M.R. and J.R. sought asylum at the time of apprehension by U.S.
22 Border Patrol. *See* U.S. MSJ Ex. D Att. 3 (0104, 0110). The remaining is undisputed.

23 71. Disputed that explanation of separation was provided in this manner. *See* U.S.
24 Opp. Ex. A Att. 6 (Comella 203-208, 213-214, 220-221).

25 72. Undisputed that M.R. and J.R. were transported to the Yuma Station. Disputed that
26 explanation of separation was provided in this manner. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 6
27 (Comella 29-30, 43, 203-208, 213-214, 220-221, 229-233, 401-402). Objection to use of
28 declaration as improper supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

1 73. Undisputed that M.R. and J.R. were detained together in the Yuma Station.
2 Undisputed that M.R. testified as much as to the remaining.

3 74. Undisputed that children were provided opportunity to bathe while in Border
4 Patrol custody and provided with new clothing. Undisputed that M.R. testified as much as
5 to the remaining.

6 75. Undisputed that detainees at times were moved in groups. Undisputed that M.R.
7 testified as much as to the remaining.

8 76. Disputed that explanation of separation was provided in this manner. *See* U.S.
9 Opp. Ex. A Att. 6 (Comella 203-208, 213-214, 220-221). Objection to use of declaration
10 as improper supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

11 77. Undisputed that M.R. was transported from Border Patrol custody to ICE custody.
12 Undisputed that M.R. testified as much as to the remaining.

13 78. Disputed that M.R. was unable to make contact with J.R. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 95
14 (and exhibits thereto).

15 79. Disputed. *See* U.S. MSJ Ex. F (De LaCruz Decl. ¶ 32); U.S. MSJ SOF 95 (and
16 exhibits thereto).

17 80. Undisputed that M.R. testified as much regarding first part of this statement of
18 fact. As to remaining, objection to use of declaration as improper supplementation and
19 amendment to deposition testimony.

20 81. Disputed that M.R. and J.R. spoke only one additional time. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF
21 95 (and exhibits thereto).

22 82. Undisputed that M.R. testified as much.

23 83. Undisputed the prosecution of M.R. was declined by the U.S. Attorney's Office
24 the day after J.R. was transferred to ORR custody.

25 84. Disputed that C.M. and B.M. sought asylum at the time of apprehension by U.S.
26 Border Patrol. *See* U.S. MSJ Ex. D Att. 5 (0031, 0037-0039). The remaining is
undisputed.

27 85. Undisputed that C.M. and B.M. were transported to the Yuma Station. Disputed
28 that explanation of separation was provided in this manner. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 6

1 (Comella 203-208, 213-214, 220-221). Disputed that C.M. was told “Happy Mother’s
 2 Day.” *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 6 (Comella 29-30, 43, 203-208, 213-214, 220-221, 229-
 3 233, 401-402). Objection to use of declaration as improper supplementation and
 4 amendment to deposition testimony.

5 86. Undisputed that children were provided opportunity to bathe while in Border
 6 Patrol custody. Disputed that explanation of separation was provided in this manner. *See*
 7 U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 6 (Comella 203-208, 213-214, 220-221). Objection to use of
 8 declaration as improper supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

9 87. Disputed as to portion stating that officer laughed and made fun of accent. *See*
 10 U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 6 (Comella 29-30, 43, 203-208, 229-233, 401-402). As to
 11 remainder, undisputed that C.M. avers as much. Objection to use of declaration as
 12 improper supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

13 88. Undisputed that C.M. avers as much. Objection to use of declaration as improper
 14 supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

15 89. Undisputed that C.M. avers as much. Objection to use of declaration as improper
 16 supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

17 90. Undisputed that C.M. avers as much. Objection to use of declaration as improper
 18 supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

19 91. Undisputed C.M. avers as much. Objection to use of declaration as improper
 20 supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

21 92. Undisputed C.M. avers as much. Objection to use of declaration as improper
 22 supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

23 93. Disputed as to length of time between calls and insofar as this statement of fact is
 24 intended to assert that detainees were not provided with ways to communicate with
 25 family members. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 60 (and exhibits thereto); *see* Pls. Ex. 84 (stating
 26 policy of access to phones in detention facilities); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 8 (Harper 79,
 27 125-127) (testifying to detainee access to phones); U.S. MSJ Ex. F (DeLaCruz Decl. ¶
 28 32); U.S. MSJ SOF 131 (and exhibits thereto). Objection to use of declaration as
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 8010
 8011
 8012
 8013
 8014
 8015
 8016
 8017
 8018
 8019
 8020
 8021
 8022
 8023
 8024
 8025
 8026
 8027
 8028
 8029
 8030
 8031
 8032
 8033
 8034
 8035
 8036
 8037
 8038
 8039
 8040
 8041
 8042
 8043
 8044
 8045
 8046
 8047
 8048
 8049
 8050
 8051
 8052
 8053
 8054
 8055
 8056
 8057
 8058
 8059
 8060
 8061
 8062
 8063
 8064
 8065
 8066
 8067
 8068
 8069
 8070
 8071
 8072
 8073
 8074
 8075
 8076
 8077
 8078
 8079
 8080
 8081
 8082
 8083
 8084
 8085
 8086
 8087
 8088
 8089
 8090
 8091
 8092
 8093
 8094
 8095
 8096
 8097
 8098
 8099
 80100
 80101
 80102
 80103
 80104
 80105
 80106
 80107
 80108
 80109
 80110
 80111
 80112
 80113
 80114
 80115
 80116
 80117
 80118
 80119
 80120
 80121
 80122
 80123
 80124
 80125
 80126
 80127
 80128
 80129
 80130
 80131
 80132
 80133
 80134
 80135
 80136
 80137
 80138
 80139
 80140
 80141
 80142
 80143
 80144
 80145
 80146
 80147
 80148
 80149
 80150
 80151
 80152
 80153
 80154
 80155
 80156
 80157
 80158
 80159
 80160
 80161
 80162
 80163
 80164
 80165
 80166
 80167
 80168
 80169
 80170
 80171
 80172
 80173
 80174
 80175
 80176
 80177
 80178
 80179
 80180
 80181
 80182
 80183
 80184
 80185
 80186
 80187
 80188
 80189
 80190
 80191
 80192
 80193
 80194
 80195
 80196
 80197
 80198
 80199
 80200
 80201
 80202
 80203
 80204
 80205
 80206
 80207
 80208
 80209
 80210
 80211
 80212
 80213
 80214
 80215
 80216
 80217
 80218
 80219
 80220
 80221
 80222
 80223
 80224
 80225
 80226
 80227
 80228
 80229
 80230
 80231
 80232
 80233
 80234
 80235
 80236
 80237
 80238
 80239
 80240
 80241
 80242
 80243
 80244
 80245
 80246
 80247
 80248
 80249
 80250
 80251
 80252
 80253
 80254
 80255
 80256
 80257
 80258
 80259
 80260
 80261
 80262
 80263
 80264
 80265
 80266
 80267
 80268
 80269
 80270
 80271
 80272
 80273
 80274
 80275
 80276
 80277
 80278
 80279
 80280
 80281
 80282
 80283
 80284
 80285
 80286
 80287
 80288
 80289
 80290
 80291
 80292
 80293
 80294
 80295
 80296
 80297
 80298
 80299
 80300
 80301
 80302
 80303
 80304
 80305
 80306
 80307
 80308
 80309
 80310
 80311
 80312
 80313
 80314
 80315
 80316
 80317
 80318
 80319
 80320
 80321
 80322
 80323
 80324
 80325
 80326
 80327
 80328
 80329
 80330
 80331
 80332
 80333
 80334
 80335
 80336
 80337
 80338
 80339
 80340
 80341
 80342
 80343
 80344
 80345
 80346
 80347
 80348
 80349
 80350
 80351
 80352
 80353
 80354
 80355
 80356
 80357
 80358
 80359
 80360
 80361
 80362
 80363
 80364
 80365
 80366
 80367
 80368
 80369
 80370
 80371
 80372
 80373
 80374
 80375
 80376
 80377
 80378
 80379
 80380
 80381
 80382
 80383
 80384
 80385
 80386
 80387
 80388
 80389
 80390
 80391
 80392
 80393
 80394
 80395
 80396
 80397
 80398
 80399
 80400
 80401
 80402
 80403
 80404
 80405
 80406
 80407
 80408
 80409
 80410
 80411
 80412
 80413
 80414
 80415
 80416
 80417
 80418
 80419
 80420
 80421
 80422
 80423
 80424
 80425
 80426
 80427
 80428
 80429
 80430
 80431
 80432
 80433
 80434
 80435
 80436
 80437
 80438
 80439
 80440
 80441
 80442
 80443
 80444
 80445
 80446
 80447
 80448
 80449
 80450
 80451
 80452
 80453
 80454
 80455
 80456
 80457
 80458
 80459
 80460
 80461
 80462
 80463
 80464
 80465
 80466
 80467
 80468
 80469
 80470
 80471
 80472
 80473
 80474
 80475
 80476
 80477
 80478
 80479
 80480
 80481
 80482
 80483
 80484
 80485
 80486
 80487
 80488
 80489
 80490
 80491
 80492
 80493
 80494
 80495
 80496
 80497
 80498
 80499
 80500
 80501
 80502
 80503
 80504
 80505
 80506
 80507
 80508
 80509
 80510
 80511
 80512
 80513
 80514
 80515
 80516
 80517
 80518
 80519
 80520
 80521
 80522
 80523
 80524
 80525
 80526
 80527
 80528
 80529
 80530
 80531
 80532
 80533
 80534
 80535
 80536
 80537
 80538
 80539
 80540
 80541
 80542
 80543
 80544
 80545
 8054

1 94. Undisputed as to what was stated to B.M. Disputed insofar as this statement of
2 fact is intended to assert that C.M. was not located and additional calls did not take place.
3 *See U.S. MSJ SOF 51, 60 (and exhibits thereto).*

4 95. Undisputed that C.M. avers as much. Objection to use of declaration as improper
5 supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

6 96. Undisputed.

7 97. Undisputed that the prosecution of C.M. was declined three days after B.M. was
8 transferred to ORR custody.

9 98. Disputed insofar as C.M. was apprehended for violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1325 and
10 detained during the pendency of the criminal referral process. *See U.S. MSJ SOF 116,*
11 122 (and exhibits thereto).

12 99. Disputed that O.A. and L.A. sought asylum at the time of apprehension by U.S.
13 Border Patrol. *See U.S. MSJ Ex. D Att. 3 (0127, 0134).* Undisputed as to remaining.

14 100. Undisputed that O.A. and L.A. were transported to the Yuma Station. Undisputed
15 that O.A. avers as much as to the remaining. Objection to use of declaration as improper
16 supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

17 101. Undisputed that O.A. avers as much. Objection to use of declaration as improper
18 supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

19 102. Undisputed that children were provided opportunity to bathe while in Border
20 Patrol custody. Undisputed that O.A. testified as much as to the remaining.

21 103. Undisputed that children were provided opportunity to bathe while in Border
22 Patrol custody. Undisputed that L.A. was removed from O.A. to be transferred to ORR
23 custody. Objection to use of declaration as improper supplementation and amendment to
24 deposition testimony.

25 104. Disputed that explanation of separation was provided in this manner. *See U.S.*
26 *Opp. Ex. A Att. 6 (Comella 203-208, 213-214, 220-221).* Objection to use of declaration
27 as improper supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

28 105. Undisputed that O.A. avers as much. Objection to use of declaration as improper
supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

1 106. Undisputed that O.A. was transferred to at least two detention facilities while in
2 ICE custody. Disputed insofar as this statement of fact is intended to assert that detainees
3 were not provided with ways to communicate with family members. *See* Pls. Ex. 84
4 (stating policy of access to phones in detention facilities); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 8 (Harper
5 79, 125-127) (testifying to detainee access to phones); U.S. MSJ Ex. F (DeLaCruz Decl.
6 ¶ 32). Objection to use of declaration as improper supplementation and amendment to
7 deposition testimony.

8 107. Undisputed that O.A. avers as much. Objection to use of declaration as improper
9 supplementation and amendment to deposition testimony.

10 108. Disputed as to amount of time before first communication. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF
11 113 (and exhibits thereto). Objection to use of declaration as improper supplementation
12 and amendment to deposition testimony. Undisputed that O.A. testified as much as to
13 remaining.

14 109. Undisputed that O.A. testified as much.

15 110. Undisputed that the prosecution of O.A. was declined by the U.S. Attorney's
16 Office for the District of Arizona the day after L.A. was transferred to ORR custody.

17 111. Disputed insofar as O.A. was apprehended for violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1325 and
18 detained during the pendency of the criminal referral process. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 98, 103
19 (and exhibits thereto).

20 112. Undisputed.

21 113. Undisputed that L.G. and B.G. were transported to the Yuma Station. Disputed
22 that explanation of separation was provided in this manner. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 6
23 (Comella 203-208, 213-214, 220-221).

24 114. Undisputed that L.G. and B.G. were detained together until B.G. was to be
25 transferred to ORR custody. As to remaining, undisputed that L.G. testified as much.
26 Objection to statement attributed to B.G. as hearsay.

27 115. Disputed that explanation of separation was provided in this manner. *See* U.S.
28 Opp. Ex. A Att. 6 (Comella 203-208, 213-214, 220-221).

1 116. Undisputed as to timing of first communication. Disputed that duration of call
 2 was six minutes. *See* U.S. MSJ Ex. F. Att. 2 (0432) (documenting call lasted for 25
 3 minutes). Undisputed that L.G. testified as much as to remaining.

4 117. Disputed that only spoke one additional time. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 77 (and exhibits
 5 thereto). Disputed insofar as this statement of fact is intended to assert that detainees
 6 were not provided with ways to communicate with family members. *See* Pls. Ex. 84
 7 (stating policy of access to phones in detention facilities); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 8 (Harper
 8 79, 125-127) (testifying to detainee access to phones); U.S. MSJ Ex. F (DeLaCruz Decl.
 9 ¶ 32).

10 118. Undisputed that the prosecution of L.G. was declined by the U.S. Attorney's
 11 Office the day after B.G. was transferred to ORR custody.

12 119. Disputed insofar as L.G. was apprehended for violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1325 and
 13 detained during the pendency of the criminal referral process. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 63, 65
 14 (and exhibits thereto).

15 120. Undisputed as to lack of documentation of which Border Patrol agents separated
 16 Plaintiffs and their children prior to final book outs at the Yuma Border Station.

17 121. Undisputed that on June 20, 2018 then-President Trump signed Executive Order
 18 13841. Disputed that Executive Order 13851 explicitly revoked the DHS Referral Policy.
 19 *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 39 (and exhibits thereto).

20 122. Disputed that such a directive was issued following Executive Order 13841, as
 21 none of the exhibits proffered in support of this statement of fact contain such a directive
 22 and are noted as pre-decisional. Disputed insofar as the statement of fact is intended to
 23 assert that reunifications would not also occur following a release of a parent from ICE
 24 custody. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 30 (and exhibits thereto).

25 123. Undisputed that the reunification of families meeting the class membership
 26 definition was ordered in accordance with the terms of the court order issued in *Ms. L. v.*
 27 *ICE*, Case No. 18-cv-428 (S.D. Cal. June 26, 2018).

28 124. Undisputed that a team was assembled to assist with reunifications of class
 members within the time periods ordered by the court in *Ms. L. v. ICE*, Case No. 18-cv-

1 428 (S.D. Cal. June 26, 2018). Disputed that the team was created “because there was no
2 plan for reunifying families.” *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 30-31 (and exhibits thereto).

3 125. Undisputed, but noted that L.A. had been released from ORR custody on July 2,
4 2018 to live with her uncle. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 111 (and exhibits thereto).

5 126. Undisputed that the quoted language appears in the cited media article used as
6 Plaintiffs’ exhibit. Disputed insofar as this statement of fact is intended to assert that the
7 DHS Referral Policy was intended by the decisionmaker, Secretary Nielsen, to use the
8 separation of parents and children as a deterrent to migration. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 11-14,
9 18-19 (and exhibits thereto), U.S. MSJ Ex. B Att. 1 at 46-47, U.S. Ex. B. Att. 2 at 18-19.
10 Objection to cited media article for failure to authenticate the article and the quoted
11 statements therein and as hearsay.

12 127. Undisputed that the quoted language appears in the cited document. Disputed
13 insofar as this statement of fact is intended to assert that the DHS Referral Policy was
14 intended by the decisionmaker, Secretary Nielsen, to use the separation of parents and
15 children as a deterrent to migration. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 11-14, 18-19 (and exhibits
16 thereto), U.S. MSJ Ex. B Att. 1 at 46-47, U.S. Ex. B. Att. 2 at 18-19.

17 128. Undisputed that the quoted language appears in the cited document. Disputed
18 insofar as this statement of fact is intended to assert that the DHS Referral Policy was
19 intended by the decisionmaker, Secretary Nielsen, to use the separation of parents and
20 children as a deterrent to migration. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 11-14, 18-19 (and exhibits
21 thereto), U.S. MSJ Ex. B Att. 1 at 46-47, U.S. Ex. B. Att. 2 at 18-19.

22 129. Undisputed that the quoted language appears in the cited Executive Order.
23 Disputed insofar as this statement of fact is intended to assert that the DHS Referral
24 Policy was intended by the decisionmaker, Secretary Nielsen, to use the separation of
25 parents and children as a deterrent to migration. *See* U.S. MSJ SOF 11-14, 18-19 (and
26 exhibits thereto), U.S. MSJ Ex. B Att. 1 at 46-47, U.S. Ex. B. Att. 2 at 18-19. Objection
27 to cited media article (Pls. Ex. 81) for failure to authenticate the article and the quoted
28 statements therein and as hearsay.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. The so-called El Paso Initiative was not created at the headquarters level of the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”), Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”), or U.S. Border Patrol. It was a local practice initiated at a particular Border Patrol Sector. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 1 (McAleenan 165); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 9 (Vitiello 80-81, 114-116); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 10 (Bash 19-21).

2. Then-CBP Commissioner Kevin McAleenan, then-Deputy CBP Commissioner Ronald Vitiello, and then-U.S Border Patrol Chief Carla Provost were unaware of the El Paso Initiative until November 2017, or after, and the initiative was discontinued in November 2017. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 1 (McAleenan 165); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 9 (Vitiello 80-81,114-116); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 10 (Bash 19-21).

3. In instances where Border Patrol agents in the Yuma Border Patrol Station determined that an adult in a family unit was to be processed for a referral for prosecution, and consequently that his or her child would be transferred to ORR custody, a parent would be informed that his or her child would be transferred to separate custody. *See U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 6 (Comella 203-208, 213-214, 220-221); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 1 (McAleenan 149).*

4. U.S. Border Patrol stations are intended and designed for short-term detention and not intended for detention of children. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 5 (Jordan 187-188).

5. The statements alleged by Plaintiffs at Pls. SOF 56, 59, 72, 76, 85 were not witnessed by or reported to Supervisory Border Patrol Agent Comella in the Yuma Station, a supervising agent in the Yuma Station PST Unit during the time period such alleged statements occurred. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 6 (Comella 29-30, 43, 203-208, 229-233, 401-402).

6. In instances where a child was transferred to ORR custody and his or her parent to ICE custody, Border Patrol agents would not know how long the separate custody would last. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 5 (Jordan 134-135).

7. In May and June 2018, when the DHS Referral Policy was in effect and applicable to adults traveling in family units, the processing of an adult non-citizen for a prosecution

1 referral by the Yuma Station PST Unit was performed with the understanding that the US
2 Attorney's Office was to accept all cases for illegal entry pursuant to the Attorney
3 General's zero tolerance policy. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 5 (Jordan 59, 114, 130, 137-
4 138); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 12 (USAO 30(b)(6) 87, 140); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 6
5 (Comella 29, 390-391).

6 8. In May and June 2018, when the DHS Referral Policy was in effect and applicable
7 to adults traveling in family units, in all cases where an adult non-citizen was identified to
8 be processed for a prosecution referral by the Yuma Station PST Unit, it was performed
9 with the intention that the non-citizen be referred for prosecution. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A
10 Att. 5 (Jordan 59, 114, 130, 137-138).

11 9. The process in May 2018 by which the Yuma Sector Prosecutions Unit would
12 indicate for the U.S. Attorney's Office those cases for which the Prosecutions Unit
13 believed there were potential grounds for declination was to assist in expediting the U.S.
14 Attorney's review process, but in all cases the U.S. Attorney's Office was responsible for
15 the ultimate decision as to whether a case was legally sufficient or prosecutable. *See* U.S.
16 Opp. Ex. A Att. 11 (Ramirez 93, 140-141, 182-183, 207, 296, 331-334).

17 10. In May and June 2018, when the DHS Referral Policy was in effect and applicable
18 to adults traveling in family units, the Yuma Sector Prosecutions Unit's referred cases for
19 prosecution in good faith. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 12 (USAO 30(b)(6) 222).

20 11. In the Yuma Sector in May and June 2018, when the DHS Referral Policy was in
21 effect and applicable to adults traveling in family units, over forty (40) percent of the
22 family units that unlawfully crossed the U.S.-Mexico border and were apprehended in the
23 Yuma Sector were not separated. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 5 (Jordan 93-95, 103-104).

24 12. In the Yuma Sector prior to the DHS Referral Policy, when an adult member of a
25 family unit was identified to be processed for a prosecution referral, an ORR placement
26 request was made as soon as practicable following the decision to process that adult for a
27 referral for prosecution. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 5 (Jordan 52-53, 55-56, 110-111); U.S.
28 Opp. Ex. A Att. 6 (Comella 374-380); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 12 (Hastings 146-147).

1 13. Both before and during the time the DHS Referral Policy was in effect, in the
 2 Yuma Sector, the process in place whereby ORR placement requests were made as soon
 3 as practicable by the Yuma Station PST Unit following a decision upon intake that the
 4 adult member of the family unit would be processed for a prosecution referral took into
 5 account (1) considerations of time constraints imposed by the TVPRA, the Flores
 6 Settlement Agreement, TEDS, and agency direction to try to transfer minors out of
 7 Border Patrol custody within twenty-four (24) hours; (2) the geographic remoteness of
 8 the Yuma Sector; (3) the uncertainties relating to when the criminal process could be
 9 completed; (4) the impact that delaying transfer to ORR custody could have on child
 10 welfare; and (5) the impact that delaying transfer to ORR custody would have on the
 11 processing, care, and detention of all detainees and on border security. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex.
 12 A Att. 5 (Jordan 122-123, 126-129, 184-194, 200-204); U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 12 (USAO
 13 30(b)(6) 80-82); *see also* U.S. MSJ Ex. A Att. 1 (McAleenan 67-68, 92-93).

14 14. In May and June 2018, when the DHS Referral Policy was in effect and applicable
 15 to adults traveling in family units, the Yuma Sector was experiencing a high volume of
 16 apprehensions and detainees at an irregular and fluctuating rate, with a daily average of
 17 392 detainees in the Yuma Sector. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 5 (Jordan 40, 181, 194-
 18 200), U.S. Opp. Ex. C; U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 6 (Comella 394, 413-414); U.S. Opp. Ex. A
 19 Att. 13 (Hastings 101-102, 134).

20 15. Performing the various tasks in a Border Patrol station relating to the processing,
 21 care, custody, and movement of detainees involves multiple agents performing different
 22 aspects of those various tasks, with an objective of transferring detainees out of Border
 23 Patrol custody as quickly as possible. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 5 (Jordan 80, 84-85,
 24 145).

25 16. On rare occasions, a child was still present in the Border Patrol station at the time
 26 the child's parent's prosecution was declined or otherwise completed. On these
 27 occasions, whether to reunify and reprocess a parent and child as a family unit was left to
 28 the discretion of the Border Patrol agents taking into account considerations that included
 (1) the Border Patrol resources necessary to identify these rare situations and reprocess

1 the individuals; (2) the additional time in Border Patrol custody that would result from
2 such reunification and reprocessing; and (3) the impacts on other detainees relating to
3 processing and time in Border Patrol custody. *See* U.S. Opp. Ex. A Att. 5 (Jordan 174-
4 175, 206-210); *see also* U.S. MSJ Ex. A Att. 1 (McAleenan 94-95, 222, 293).

5
6 Dated: April 24, 2023

7 Respectfully Submitted,

8
9 BRIAN M. BOYNTON
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General

10 JAMES G. TOUHEY, JR.
11 Director, Torts Branch

12 s/ Phil MacWilliams
13 PHILIP D. MACWILLIAMS
14 Trial Attorney
15 D.C. Bar No. 482883
16 E-mail: phil.macwilliams@usdoj.gov
17 U.S. Department of Justice
18 Civil Division, Torts Branch
19 Benjamin Franklin Station, P.O. Box 888
20 Washington, DC 20044
21 Telephone: (202) 616-4285
22 Attorneys for the United States of America

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 24, 2023, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to all CM/ECF registrants.

s/ Phil MacWilliams
PHILIP D. MACWILLIAMS
Attorney for United States of America